



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/786,436	07/16/2001	Hermann Wagner	C1041/7010	1340	
7590 11/29/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Alan W Steele			WHITEMAN, BRIAN A		
Wolf Greenfield	l & Sacks				
Federal Reserve Plaza			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
600 Atlantic Avenue			1635		
Boston, MA 02210-2211			DATE MAILED: 11/29/200	DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/786,436	WAGNER ET AL.	
Lammer-minated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian Whiteman	1635	
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>After Final</u>		
(1) <u>Brian Whiteman</u> .	(3)		
(2) Adel Stone.	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>15 November 2005</u>	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	ant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A			
Claims discussed: N/A			
Prior art documents discussed: N/A			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand 	ne examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview	
Duilles			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representative S	signature – if appropriate)	



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant needed clarification on the time period for reply from the mailing date of the final rejection because applicat filed the response to the final rejection on 3 month date (10/7/05) and should not have been charged a one month extension, The time period is 3 months and not 4 months for reply from the mailing date of the final rejection. The charge for the one month extension has not been charged to applicant.